



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,570	05/29/2001	Shinobu Ozeki	109663	3660
25944	7590	09/26/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			POON, KING Y	
P.O. BOX 19928			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			2625	

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/865,570

Applicant(s)

OZEKI ET AL.

Examiner

King Y. Poon

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not support a multifunctional device as claimed.

For example, the applicant defines, in specification page 1, lines 10-16, page 13, lines 14-19, that the image output unit, first functional unit, second functional unit, signal transmission medium, as devices and the combination as a system.

Furthermore, page 14, lines 1-3, defines the functional unit as apparatus such as a scanner, or digital camera. The connections of the scanner and the digital camera forms a system.

From the point of view of the examiner, the individual devices such as a printer, a scanner, and a digital camera connected together forms a system, not a device.

Therefore, 112 first paragraph rejection is being made by the examiner.

The prior art rejection is based on the view of the applicant if the applicant believes individual devices/apparatus such as a printer, a scanner, and a digital camera, connected together forms a device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al (US 5,872,869) and Shang (US 5,077,817).

Regarding claims 1: Shimizu et al. teach a multifunction system/device comprising: an image output unit (the first system/image processing apparatus of column 3, lines 47-53, fig. 1) that has an image signal input unit capable of receiving an optical signal (70, fig. 2), and outputs an image according to an optical signal inputted from the image signal input unit (column 6, lines 38-45, the signal input unit of the first apparatus that received image signal from other system through optical fiber, and print the received image, column 7, lines 20-33); a first functional unit (the second system/image processing apparatus of column 3, lines 47-53, fig. 1) that has a first optical signal output unit (70, fig. 2) capable of outputting an optical signal and outputs the optical signal according to a first function through the first optical signal output unit (column 7, lines 10-20); a second functional unit (the third system/image processing

Art Unit: 2625

apparatus of column 3, lines 47-53, fig. 1) that has a second optical signal output unit (70, fig. 2, and the software of controller that controls the outputting of optical signal to other systems column 7, lines 10-20) capable of outputting an optical signal and an optical signal input unit (70, fig. 2, and the software of controller that controls the inputting of optical signal to other systems column 7, lines 22-34) capable of receiving an optical signal, and outputs an optical signal according to a second function through the second optical signal output unit, and receives an optical signal inputted through the second optical signal input unit, and a distribution-type optical signal transmission medium (optical fiber network, column 3, lines 50-53; note) to which the image signal input unit, the first optical signal output unit, the second optical signal output unit, and the optical signal input unit are connected and which distributes an optical signal outputted from at least the first optical signal output unit to the image signal input unit and the optical signal input unit, and transmits an optical signal outputted from the second optical signal output unit to the image signal input unit (column 3, lines 45-55, column 7, lines 10-35).

Note: Shimizu does not use the phrase "distribution type optical signal transmission medium" to describe his optical fiber network.

Shang disclosed that optical fiber network (column 1, lines 10-20) is inherently a "distribution (column 1, line 14, column 1, lines 35-36) type optical signal transmission (column 2, line 53) medium (allow light to go through, column 2, lines 35-40)" or at least it is well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to use the conventional optical fiber network for the system of Shimizu such that Shimizu's system would be properly functioned.

Regarding claim 2, Shimizu et al, teach the multifunction system/device according to claim 1, wherein the first optical signal output unit and the second optical signal output unit include a unit that generates plural optical signals of different types, and the image signal input unit and the optical signal input unit include an extraction part that extracts an optical signal of a specific type from inputted optical signals (column 6, lines 38-45, the systems transmit and receive/extract both optical control signals and optical image signals using optical fibers 701, 702, 703 & 704).

Regarding claim 6, Shimizu et al, teach the multifunction system/device according to claim 2, further comprising: an arbitrating part that arbitrates the respective communications of the image output unit, the first functional unit, and the second functional unit by specifying the types of optical signals to be outputted by the first optical signal output unit and the second optical signal output unit, and the types of optical signals to be extracted by the image signal input unit and the optical signal input unit (column 6, lines 38-45, system transmits and receives/extracts control signals and image signals using optical fibers 701, 702, 703 & 704, furthermore, column 5:lines 32-39, signal lines 136 and 139 connect the CPU circuit block 10 to the optical fiber interface 70 for enabling the control information for input and output signals).

Regarding claim 8: Shimizu teaches wherein the image output unit comprises a printer (column 3, lines 49-50), the first functional unit comprises an image reading

Art Unit: 2625

device (column 3, lines 49-50), and the second functional unit comprises at least a storage part (20, 90, fig. 2) that stores a signal inputted from the optical signal input unit, wherein the first functional unit outputs an optical signal in accordance with an image to be printed (column 7, lines 10-35), the second functional unit stores in the storage part a signal according to the optical signal inputted through the optical signal input unit (column 8, lines 40-45, fig. 2), and outputs the optical signal in accordance with the image through the second optical signal output unit (column 7, lines 10-20); and the image output unit prints the image according to the optical signal inputted from the second functional unit through the image signal input unit (column 7, lines 10-35).

Regarding claim 9, Shimizu et al., teach the multifunction system/device according to claim 1, further comprising: a third functional unit (the fourth system of column 3, lines 47-53) having a third optical signal output unit, the third optical signal output unit outputting an optical signal according to a third function to the distribution-type optical signal transmission medium, wherein the first functional unit outputs an optical signal to the image output unit through the first optical signal output unit, and the third functional unit transmits an optical signal to the second functional unit through the third optical signal output unit (figure 1 & column 3 lines 22-53, optical signal transmission medium is accomplished through optical fiber cables that network other similar systems)

Regarding claim 10: Shang teaches wherein the distribution type optical signal transmission medium has a plurality of input ports and a plurality of output ports and an

Art Unit: 2625

input from one of the plurality of the input ports is transmitted to the plurality of output ports (column 1, lines 14-20).

5. Claim 4, 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. (US 5,872,869) and Shang as applied to claims 1, 2 above and further in view of Hirota et al. (US 5,822,475).

Regarding claim 4, Shimizu et al., teach the multifunction system/device according to claim 2, but do not teach wherein the plural optical signals of different types are optical signals with different wavelengths.

However, Hirota et al., teach signals of different wavelengths that are transmitted in the optical transmission system (column 3, lines 57-61, transmitting and receiving a plurality of optical signals is accomplished by discriminating them by the wavelength of each signal beam).

Also see column 2, lines 35-40 of Shang.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have used the wavelength discrimination transmission system/device of Hirota et al. and Shang, in the multifunction system of Shimizu et al, because it allows greater control of transmission without the need for a plurality of signal beam propagation layers.

Regarding claim 5, Shimizu et al, teach the multifunction system/device according to claim 2, but do not teach wherein the plural optical signals of different types are optical signals with different timings of output to the distribution-type optical signal transmission medium.

However, Horita et al., teach a optical transmission system that assigns timing for input and output of optical signals (column 7:line 67-column 8, line 8, timing is used for transmission and receiving each signal).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have used the output timing taught by Horita et al., with the multifunction system of Shimizu et al., because it allows greater control of optical signal transmission in the system.

Regarding claim 7, Shimizu et al., teach the multifunction system/devcie according to claim 1, but do not teach the system wherein the distribution-type optical transmission medium comprises a diffusion pad that diffuses an inputted optical signal. However, Hirota et al., teaches an optical transmission medium comprising a diffusion part (column 6:lines 8-24, diffusion occurs within optical transmission layer 21).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the ad at the time of the invention to have used the diffusion/distribution part taught by Hirota et al., with the multifunction system of Shimizu et al., because (column 3, lines 1-12, Hirota et al.) the optical diffusion portions or optical diffusers diffuse and propagate input signal beams, allowing a signal beam input from a certain signal beam input/output portion to transmit to any other signal beam input/output portion without fail even when there are temperature variations. Also, the number of circuit boards optically connected to the optical bus in the signal beam input/output portions can be changed to a value equal to or less than the maximum number of the signal beam input/output portions, thereby

Art Unit: 2625

making it possible to construct a system which is resistant to environmental changes and extensible.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu (US 5,872,869) and Shang as applied to claim 2 and further in view of and Atlas (US 6,295,148).

Regarding claim 3, Shimizu et al. teach the multifunction system/device according to claim 2, but do not teach wherein the plural optical signals of different types are optical signals with different intensity levels.

However, Atlas teaches an optical network for transmitting signals based on intensity levels (column 8, lines 9-12).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have used the intensity level discrimination transmission system of Atlas in the multifunction system of Shimizu et al., because it allows greater control of signal transmission.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that it has been agreed that "device" cannot be so broadly construed as to cover three instances of Shimizu's image processing

apparatus (unnumbered) interconnected by optical fiber cables 700; has been considered.

It is true that the examiner agrees, in the conventional meaning of device, a “device” does not include connecting of devices such as a scanner, digital camera, a printer connected together. The connection of a scanner, digital camera, and printer forms a system/apparatus, not a device.

Applicant defines, in specification page 1, lines 10-16, page 13, lines 14-19, that the image output unit, first functional unit, second functional unit, signal transmission medium, as devices and the combination as a system.

Furthermore, page 14, lines 1-3, defines the functional unit as apparatus such as a scanner, or digital camera. Even furthermore, applicant claim 8 further defines the image output unit is an apparatus itself comprising at least a printer, an image input unit.

Therefore, 112 first paragraph rejection is being issued based the newly amended claims.

The prior art rejection is being maintained because reading the newly amended claims in light of specification, the “device” seems to be referring to a system comprises of connect apparatuses such as a scanner, a computer, a printer, a digital camera etc.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2625

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 9, 2006



KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER